



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,883	08/07/2001	Chris Allen Broka	R0072B-REG	6198

24372 7590 03/25/2003

ROCHE PALO ALTO LLC
3401 HILLVIEW AVENUE
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT., MS A2-250
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-9819

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, BINTA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,883

Applicant(s)

BROKA ET AL.

Examiner

Binta M. Robinson

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-17 and 19-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-17, 19-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

Art Unit: 1625

Detailed Action

1. The applicant's election of species and election of group II is noted. The examiner will revise the restriction requirement as requested so that group II includes compounds of formula I in claim 1 where R1 also includes halo, cyano, and alkoxy, A can also include $-CH_2$ or $C(=O)$.

The applicant traverses the restriction requirement alleging that the entire application can be made without serious burden on the examiner. However, the applicant is claiming an invention that crosses several classifications, and radicals of a vast breadth equal to such moieties such as heterocycloamino or heteroalkyl, which would place an undue burden on the USPTO to examine. The applicant is entitled to only one independent, and distinctly, disclosed invention.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not provide enablement for R2 equal to heteroalkyl, ~~R13 and R14 coming together with the nitrogen atom to which they are attached to from a heterocycloamino group.~~ The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement. The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing

R' equal to heteroalkyl in claim 35-36

Art Unit: 1625

all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. The applicant is referred to *In re Wands*, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in Ex parte Foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In *re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In terms of the breadth of the claims, R2, ~~R13 and R14~~ encompass a much wider grouping of radicals than those radicals synthesized and tested. Compounds are only synthesized where R2 is H and ~~where R13 and R14 never come together to form a heterocycleamino~~ 2) the nature of the invention is that these compounds are anti-inflammatory and analgesic compounds In terms of the fifth, and sixth, Wands factor, the level of predictability in the art is low, the amount of direction provided by the inventor is poor, since only compounds where R2 equals H, and ~~where R13 and R14 never forms a heterocycleamino group~~ are synthesized. In terms of the seventh Wands

Art Unit: 1625

factor, the applicant only provides working examples where R2 is H, and ~~R13 and R14~~ are all other moieties except those forming a heterocycloamino group.

In terms of the 8th Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by the inventor. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

✓ Claim(s) 27 in part is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention. Inhibiting dipeptidyl peptidase-IV is a mechanism. The disease being treated by this inhibition is not stated. The specification must contain one practical utility in currently available form. The inhibition of an enzyme must be related to a disease that needs to be improved and this disease needs to be recited. There is no reasonable assurance that these compounds will have all of the alleged properties or have the applicants supplied the supporting data. The applicant is referred to *In re Fouché* 169 USPQ 429 ccpa, 1971, MPEP 716.02 B. The applicant is referred to *In re Wands*, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in *Ex parte Foreman* 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

100ep Claims 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the method of treating all

Art Unit: 1625

diseases related claimed, many of which are unrelated. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement.

The applicant is referred to *In re Wands*, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in Ex parte Foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

✓ Claims 31, 33, and 34 are objected to because there is no period at the end of these claims. A period is required to be at the end of these claims.

The election of species is allowable.

The IDS filed 9/20/01 and 3/29/02 have been considered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binta M. Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5437. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on (703)308-4698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7922 for regular communications and (703)308-7922 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0193.



ALAN L. ROTMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600